



**METRO**

2000 S.W. First Avenue  
Portland, OR 97201-5398  
503/221-1646

# Memorandum

Date: January 7, 1988

To: JPACT/Metro Council

From: *AC* Andrew C. Cotugno, Transportation Director

Regarding: Transportation 2020 Program

ODOT and the Oregon Highway Users Federation will be conducting a public hearing in Salem on January 21, 1988 on the Transportation 2020 Program. There is a major nationwide effort to define the future direction for the federal role in highways and transit. Although the Surface Transportation Act is not due for renewal until 1991, it will be a significant one because one-fourth of the highway program (\$3 billion/year) associated with completion of the Interstate highway system will be terminated. Proposals for use of the funds involve a very broad range from dropping the federal gas tax to reprogramming the \$3 billion into other categories.

Attached is a proposed position paper for submittal to the hearing on behalf of the metropolitan area.

ACC:lmk

Attachment

**TRANSPORTATION**   
*America's Future Depends on it* **2020**

**Announcing  
a Public Forum  
in Oregon  
on the**

**Future of Transportation  
into the 21st Century**

**Date:** Thursday, January 21, 1988

**Location:** Hearing Room A  
State Capitol  
Salem

**Hours:** 9:00 a.m. - 11:30 a.m.  
1:15 p.m. - 4:15 p.m.

Sponsored by the  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
and the  
Oregon Highway Users Conference  
in cooperation with the  
Advisory Committee on Highway Policy  
of the  
2020 Consensus Transportation Program

# TRANSPORTATION

America's Future Depends on it **2020**



## What is "Transportation 2020?"

The Transportation 2020 project is a multi-year multi-faceted effort to develop a transportation plan that will meet the nation's mobility needs well into the 21st Century.

Under the project, people representing the public and private sector interest groups will work together to:

1. Assess America's surface transportation requirements through the Year 2020
2. Develop alternative proposals for meeting those requirements at the federal, state and local levels; and
3. Achieve a consensus on the best means of getting the job done.

The forum announced by this folder, and your participation in the forum, is vital to the assessment process.

## Who is involved?

A broad range of organizations and agencies has been invited to participate in the Transportation 2020 project. They represent every segment of society that uses and relies on our national transportation system for economic prosperity and social mobility. They represent the managers of highway systems. Included are state and local government officials, highway users organizations, trade and industry associations, civic groups and interested private citizens.

An Advisory Committee on Highway Policy of more than 100 organizations has been created by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials specifically to obtain the perspectives of these organizations, agencies and individuals on the nation's transportation needs. The committee is chaired by Lester P. Lamm, President of the Highway Users Federation, and former Deputy Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration.

## What is the goal?

The Transportation 2020 goal is to reach agreement on the needs picture and the public and private sector roles in a national surface transportation plan for the 1990s and beyond . . . a consensus transportation program that will keep America moving well into the 21st Century.

## What is the process?

Transportation 2020 will entail four distinct phases over the next two years:

1. Information gathering to identify surface transportation needs.
2. Defining alternatives for meeting the needs.
3. Reaching agreement on the best plan.
4. Securing enactment on the plan through state and federal legislation.

## What are the state forums all about?

A key component of the Transportation 2020 project is to obtain from the users and managers of the highway system their perspectives on transportation needs in every state.

This particular forum is your opportunity to present your opinion. You are urged to participate through an oral statement, or by submitted written testimony.

The state forums are meant to be open-ended on the subject of ground transportation. For example, topics might include the following:

- Does traffic congestion impact delivery of materials to places of business?
- Are workers burdened by long commuting times?
- Is there adequate access to state or regional recreation areas?

A questionnaire addressing some of these issues is included with the registration form to gather opinion in advance of the forum. Please complete and return it by the deadline indicated.

The Transportation 2020 forums are not intended to produce the answers to the transportation problems each state or the nation as a whole may face. Solutions and the subject of financing will come later in the project. But it is important that the concerns of responsible people in the states be known if there is to be a realistic, fully-supported plan to meet truly America's future transportation needs.

## The Nation's Highway Transportation System

The U.S. has nearly 4 million miles of roads, streets, and highways. In 1985, total travel on that system reached a record 1.77 trillion vehicle miles, an increase of 7.6 percent since 1983. Urban travel increased by 10.1 percent during the period and now represents nearly 60 percent of total highway travel. Travel is increasing in every region of the country, and congestion has worsened since 1983.

The Federal-aid System consists of 843,309 highway miles, including the Interstate System. When completed in the early 1990s, the Interstate will comprise more than 43,000 miles and will carry more than 20 percent of all highway travel. Yet more than one of every 10 Interstate miles is rated in "poor" condition, and the percentage of Interstate bridges classified as deficient rose from 10.6 in 1982 to 13.1 in 1986.

Although reconstruction and resurfacing improvements have been made, less than one-fourth of non-

Interstate urban and rural arterials are considered in "very good" condition.

Looking to the future, the cost to maintain 1983 overall highway conditions on non-local roads through the year 2000 is estimated at \$315 billion, or \$19.7 billion a year. Estimated cost to bring all deficient bridges up to current standards is \$51.4 billion.

But these estimates do not allow for expansion of the highway system to accommodate present and future travel increases. Even though travel will double in many states and metropolitan areas after the turn of the century, there is no national plan for shaping a highway program to meet these demands in the 1990s and beyond. Because today's decisions will influence highway transportation well into the next century, the time to begin shaping such a program is now.

## Oregon's Transportation System

The Oregon Department of Transportation is a diverse agency that administers programs that are designed to contribute to the growth and economy of the state by providing for the safe, efficient and economic movement of people, goods, and services.

There are more than 100,000 miles of roadways in Oregon. The Highway Division is responsible for the construction, improvement, maintenance, and operation of the state highway system. This system totals 7,600 miles; 750 of these are Interstate. The state highway network carries about 60 percent of total vehicle miles of travel and nearly 70 percent of ton-miles of travel in the state.

Additionally, the Highway Division provides technical and financial assistance to local governments. Oregon counties have 28,000 miles of roads, and Oregon cities have 7,000 miles of roads under their jurisdictions.

There are 6,800 bridges in the state; 2,500 maintained by the state and 4,300 maintained by local jurisdictions. Of these bridges, 250 are currently deficient and 490 are predicted to become deficient within the next 20 years. Total bridge improvements over the next 20 years are predicted to cost \$785 million.

In December 1986, the Oregon Department of Transportation, the Association of Oregon Counties, and the League of Oregon Cities published a landmark study called "Making the Right Turn," which

detailed the road funding gap between needs and available revenues. This report identified \$21 billion (\$6 billion state, \$11 billion county, and \$4 billion city) of unfunded needs. An increase in the state highway user fees enacted by the 1987 legislature will help fund some of these improvements.

In the major urban areas, public transit significantly supplements the capacity of the road network. The Public Transit Division plays an important role in the development of local public transit systems, particularly in small communities and rural areas. Funding transit needs is a continuing high priority in Oregon.

The Aeronautics Division operates a system of 36 state owned airports and provides guidance and assistance to municipal, county, and port district airport sponsors. The Division maintains and refines a continuous aviation system plan included as a part of the national plan of integrated airports.

Railroads and ports also play a vital role in the state's transportation network. Oregon is served by three major railroad companies and twenty-three port districts.

A good transportation infrastructure is essential for fostering economic development throughout the state. The Oregon Department of Transportation will continue to support these efforts working with local jurisdictions to maintain a balanced transportation network.

# **Transportation 2020**

## **Advisory Committee on Highway Policy**

### **Participating Organizations**

- Airport Operators Council International
- Aluminum Association
- American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators
- American Association of Port Authorities
- American Association of Retired Persons
- American Automobile Association
- American Bus Association
- American Coal Ash Association
- American Concrete Pavement Association
- American Concrete Pipe Association
- American Consulting Engineers Council
- American Driver and Traffic Safety Education Association
- American Farm Bureau Federation
- American Hotel and Motel Association
- American Institute of Steel Construction
- American Petroleum Institute
- American Planning Association
- American Public Transit Association
- American Public Works Association
- American Recreation Coalition
- American Retreaders Association
- American Road & Transportation Builders Association
- American Society of Civil Engineers
- American Traffic Safety Services Association
- American Trucking Associations, Inc.
- Asphalt Emulsion Manufacturers Association
- Asphalt Recycling & Reclaiming Association
- Associated Builders and Contractors
- Associated Equipment Distributors
- Associated General Contractors of America
- Association of American Railroads
- Association for Commuter Transportation
- Automotive Safety Foundation
- Automotive Service Industry Association
- Better Roads & Transportation Council
- Bicycle Federation
- Coalition of Northeastern Governors
- Coalition for Scenic Beauty
- Concrete Reinforcing Steel Institute
- Construction Industry Manufacturers Association
- Council of University Transportation Centers
- Dealers Safety and Mobility Council
- Eno Foundation for Transportation
- Hazardous Materials Advisory Council
- Highway Users Federation for Safety and Mobility
- Institute of the Ironworking Industry
- Institute of Transportation Engineers
- International Bridge, Tunnel and Turnpike Association
- Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association
- National Aggregates Association
- National Asphalt Pavement Association
- National Association of Counties
- National Association of County Engineers
- National Association of Governors Highway Safety Representatives
- National Association of Manufacturers
- National Association of Railroad Passengers
- National Association of Regional Councils
- National Association of State Aviation Officials
- National Association of Towns and Townships
- National Association of Truck Stop Operators
- National Automobile Dealers Association
- National Coal Association
- National Conference of State Legislatures
- National Corrugated Steel Pipe Association
- National Council on Public Works Improvement
- National Electrical Manufacturers Association
- National Governors' Association
- National Grange
- National Joint Highway and Highway Construction Committee
- National League of Cities
- National Lime Association
- National Milk Producers Federation
- National Parking Association
- National Ready Mix Concrete Association
- National Rural Letter Carriers' Association
- National Safety Council
- National School Transportation Association
- National Society of Professional Engineers
- National Stone Association
- National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association
- National Tour Association
- Outdoor Advertising Association of America
- Portland Cement Association
- Private Truck Council of America
- Recreation Vehicle Industry Association
- Rubber Manufacturers Association
- Salt Institute
- Service Station and Automotive Repair Association
- The Asphalt Institute
- The National Industrial Transportation League
- The Road Information Program
- The Urban Institute
- The Urban Land Institute
- Transportation Research Board—National Research Council
- Travel Industry Association of America
- Truck Trailer Manufacturers Association
- U.S. Chamber of Commerce
- U.S. Conference of Mayors
- United Bus Owners of America
- United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association
- Western Governors' Association
- Wire Reinforcement Institute

## Transportation 2020

### Testimony from the Portland Metropolitan Area

1. Federal Role in Transportation - Despite completion of the Interstate system, there remains a need for a strong federal role in providing and improving surface transportation systems. Transportation is key to economic prosperity and federal programs should be strengthened. Federal funding for transportation should not be eliminated or diverted toward deficit reduction.
2. Federal/State/Local Partnership - The Federal Government should continue as a partner with state and local governments to ensure a viable surface transportation system is maintained. While state and local governments bear the greatest burden for ongoing operations and maintenance of state and local systems, the federal role is important in providing assistance on high-cost improvements and providing funds for improvements to further economic objectives.
3. Focus on Transportation Systems - Federal funding programs should be primarily focused on three major systems:
  - . Primary highways serving interstate and intrastate commerce;
  - . Urban systems including transit and highway improvement to provide mobility within urban and suburban areas; and
  - . Rural systems.

In general, the current multiplicity for funding categories and demonstration projects should be simplified and targeted toward these overall categories. This would recognize these different but important components of the transportation system while allowing for state and local flexibility for planning and improvement.

4. Urban/Suburban Mobility - Federal transportation programs should continue to recognize the importance of urban and suburban mobility to national economic prosperity. Improvements to maintain and improve urban and suburban mobility should recognize the need for a balanced highway and transit investment program to both meet the needs and not introduce a federal funding bias into local improvement decisions. Suburban areas are growing beyond the capacity of their transportation systems and require a major upgrade of their transportation systems. Similarly, transportation improvements in established urban areas are complex and expensive to implement. Sufficient local, state and federal funding to meet these needs together with sufficient flexibility are essential.
5. Transit - Transit is an important complement to the urban road system, providing mobility in heavily traveled, restricted corridors and to the transit-dependent population. Federal capital and operating funds are key to meeting these needs. Of particular importance to the Portland region is increased federal funding for transit capital expansion, both bus and LRT. These high-cost improvements are essential in major regional corridors and will not be possible without federal assistance.

6. Federal Funding Level - The current federal 9-cent gas tax should be continued and measures to ensure an equitable share of funding from trucks should be pursued. General increases in funding should be tied to a comprehensive needs study similar to the Oregon Roads Study, taking into consideration needs throughout the state and local transportation systems. Increased funding should be considered for new rail starts.
  
7. Federal Tax Code - Tax code provision for employer-provided benefits to encourage carpooling, vanpooling and transit should be treated comparably to provisions affecting employer-provided parking.




**METRO**

2000 S.W. First Avenue  
Portland, OR 97201-5398  
503/221-1646

# Memorandum

Date: January 7, 1988

To: JPACT

From:  Andrew C. Cotugno, Transportation Director

Regarding: Proposed East Bank Freeway Relocation

Attached is a joint letter from ODOT and the City of Portland regarding proposals to relocate I-5 on the east bank of the Willamette River together with a letter submitted to the Portland City Council on behalf of TPAC.

ACC:lmk

Attachments





Department of Transportation  
**HIGHWAY DIVISION**

Region I

9002 SE McLOUGHLIN, MILWAUKIE, OREGON 97222 PHONE 653-3090

RECEIVED DEC 9 1987

In Reply Refer To  
File No.:

December 4, 1987

Dear Interested Party:

You may have seen recent media coverage of a proposal to relocate a portion of the eastside I-5 Freeway a few blocks to the east. Such a proposal would delay construction of new access ramps to I-5 at Water Avenue and to the Marquam Bridge from the eastside. We expect you may have questions and concerns about the immediate impact of the proposal on Portland and crucial development projects such as the Convention Center and OMSI. The purpose of this letter is to provide you with background information and to inform you of upcoming decisions.

A number of operational and access problems have long existed on I-5 between the Fremont and Marquam Bridges. In order to remove these problems, ODOT was authorized by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to develop two specific projects. The first, the East Marquam Project, covers I-5 south of the Banfield Freeway. It was previously approved by the City Council, is fully funded by FHWA and right of way has already been purchased. The second project, the I-5 (Greeley to Banfield) Project extends north of the Banfield Interchange past the Convention Center to the Fremont Bridge. This project is approved for study only, and no approvals have been given by the City Council and no funding has been committed.

During the development of the Central City Plan, various groups called for the restudy or cancellation of these projects and urged consideration of various relocations of the freeway away from the riverfront. The Planning Commission, at the time it adopted the Central City Plan, called for a study of these relocation options, to be completed by January 1989.

To address the concerns of various interest groups, the Portland Planning Commission and other decision makers, Senator Cease is convening a group to examine the possibilities of such a relocation project. Commissioner Earl Blumenauer, who oversees the Portland Office of Transportation, and Robert Bothman, director of Oregon Department of Transportation, have discussed the possibility of relocation and will direct their staffs to participate in this study. Any product of that study that is intended as a substitute for the funded East Marquam Project will have to meet the following criteria:

(Con't)


- o The project must meet the objectives of the existing East Marquam Project.
- o The project must consider opening up new areas of riverbank for non-vehicular use.
- o The project must meet highway design standards.
- o The construction must be eligible for federal highway funding.
- o The construction cost must not exceed \$54 million.
- o The revised project development must allow construction by FY 1989.

It is the intent of the city and the state to continue to pursue the land use permits for the existing East Marquam Project. The City Council is scheduled to consider these permits at a public hearing on December 23, 1987. It is expected, however, that the Council's decision will be appealed to the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) and to the Court of Appeals, as the previous approvals were. This will likely delay project bidding to late 1988.

In early February of 1988, the Council will begin hearings on the Central City Plan. It is hoped that Senator Cease's group will have identified whether or not a project is feasible by that time. If so, ODOT and the city will consider that project within the constraints identified above. If no feasible alternative proposal is advanced, the city and ODOT intend to proceed with the East Marquam Project. The existing problems of this important segment of I-5 and the growing access requirements of the Central Eastside dictate immediate action.

We encourage your participation in the upcoming Council hearings and in the work of Senator Cease's study group. The attachment provides additional background on the current projects, freeway relocation costs and funding options. If you have questions, please call either of us, ODOT's information officer Janis Collins (653-3217), or Bob Stacey, executive assistant to Commissioner Blumenauer (243-7991).

Sincerely,



Richard Kuehn, P. E.  
OSHD Region 1 Engineer



Felicia Trader, Director  
Portland Office of Transportation

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON I-5 (EASTBANK) ISSUES

### Current Projects.

The need for the East Marquam Project was first identified in the Central Eastside Revitalization Study (1977). The project's objectives are to correct:

- o Narrow lanes on the Marquam Bridge ramps.
- o A poor connection to I-84.
- o Partial, temporary and inefficient access between I-5 and the Central Eastside.
- o Traffic congestion on the Grand-Union couplet.

Over the last ten years, a project known as the East Marquam Interchange has been developed in answer to these deficiencies. It would cost about \$54 million and would be built in three phases:

Phase 1, Water Avenue Ramps, \$23 million.

- o Widens lanes on east end of Marquam Bridge.
- o Builds south portion of collector-distributor system.
- o Improves Water Avenue exit.
- o Provides new Water Avenue on-ramp southbound.

Phase 2, Banfield Access, \$10 million.

- o Continues collector-distributor roads north to Banfield.
- o Provides two lane off-ramp to Banfield northbound.

Phase 3, Grand/Union Ramps, \$21 million.

- o Provides ramps that connect I-5 on the north to McLoughlin Boulevard on the south.

There is a second proposal for a section of I-5 north of the Banfield Interchange known as I-5 Greeley-Banfield. The problems it addresses are different than those stated above. It would revise ramps in the Banfield Interchange to ease congestion, improve the surface street traffic pattern in the Weidler/Broadway area and provide for six freeway lanes south of the Fremont Bridge. None of this work is funded. The total cost is roughly estimated at \$80-90 million, but if any of this is built, it will have to be done in phases.

The proposed improvements to I-5 and adjacent roadways are timely. Several land use changes will occur in the next few years. The Station "L" property at the east end of the Marquam Bridge will be redeveloped as the new Oregon Museum of Science and Industry. It will need access to I-5 via the Morrison and the new Water Avenue ramps. The Convention Center is under construction at the junction of I-5 and I-84. The Convention Center will provide improvements to adjacent streets. Funding is being

sought for a \$5 million Phase 1 of Greeley-Banfield on I-5 to better serve that area. Extensive redevelopment is planned for the Lloyd Center area. These new developments would benefit from state proposals to optimize the freeway system in the area.

The environmental study for the East Marquam project was completed in 1980. In April 1986, during the design phase, major improvements to the city's riverfront esplanade were added to the project. During the rest of 1986, a hearings officer and the City Council approved a conditional use permit allowing construction in the greenway. That action was appealed to the Land Use Board of Appeals by the Citizens for Better Transit. LUBA determined that a goal exception was required for both the ramp construction and the esplanade fill. In September 1987, the Court of Appeals agreed with the city that a goal exception is not required for the esplanade fill. In November a hearings officer granted the goal exception for the ramp construction. An appeal of that action is pending before the City Council.

#### Freeway Relocation Options.

As part of the Central City Plan, ODOT was asked to participate in a study of possible freeway relocation options. The study group identified a relocation of I-5 to SE 8th/9th Avenues as the most worthy of design and cost analysis. ODOT estimated that this relocation would cost about \$325 million, with engineering costs and design refinements adding as much as 50 percent to that figure.

During hearings in 1987, freeway relocation alternatives were advanced by Riverfront For People II. One of the group's latest proposals would move the freeway to the area now occupied by 1st and 2nd Avenues, extending north past the Coliseum. That specific proposal costs \$275 million, plus or minus 10 percent. However, it has a number of design features that do not meet federal design standards. More detailed study would be needed to determine if these flaws could be fixed at a higher cost. In any case, it is likely a workable design would have a higher cost.

#### Funding.

Two categories of federal funds are available for use on I-5. The East Marquam project is funded with FAI (interstate completion funding). FAI was used for construction of I-5. It can be used ONLY to complete the interstate system. A document called the Interstate Cost Estimate (ICE) contains a congressionally approved description of all of the work that can be funded with this kind of money. Beside East Marquam there are only two other project areas in Oregon eligible for this kind of funding: I-5 at Delta Park and I-84 between I-205 and Troutdale. The ICE has not been open for additions or amendments since 1978.

When East Marquam, Phase 1, could not be contracted in FY 1987, another project was accelerated. It is possible another project can be accelerated to take advantage of the funding in FY 1988. But if East Marquam is not underway by FY 1989, there is no guarantee Oregon will retain the federal funding allocated for that project.

The three phases of East Marquam must be contracted separately. They are currently scheduled for 1988, 1991 and 1992. The current highway bill is expected to be the last bill to contain funding for interstate completion. Any further delay puts the funding for Phase 3 in jeopardy.

The other freeway funding available is I-4R, which is used for rehabilitation and reconstruction projects on the interstate system all around the state. In this category, Oregon receives \$38 million per year. Whether looking statewide or locally at the Portland area, the cost of needed projects is four times Oregon's allotment over the next ten years, without spending any I-4R money on I-5 in the East Marquam area.

The \$80-90 million for the Greeley-Banfield section of I-5 would be eligible for I-4R funding. But it is not a "bird-in-the-hand." That project is unfunded and the likelihood of fully funding it over the next ten years is remote, given competing regional and state priorities for freeways.

Before a new project could become a reality, the Metropolitan area would have to decide that it was a top transportation priority. Then the project would have to compete with all other needs statewide. Considering the size of the existing shortfall and the cost of most of the proposals made to date, that kind of priority consensus does not seem likely. Before any federal aid could be spent to construct a redesigned I-5, the Federal Highway Administration would have to agree that the public was receiving the project's value in transportation benefits. If the main benefit was the reclamation of the east riverbank for a new land use, the cost of the project would have to be born by some means other than the federal or state gasoline tax.



# METRO

2000 S.W. First Avenue  
Portland, OR 97201-5398  
503/221-1646

December 23, 1987

The Honorable J.E. (Bud) Clark  
City of Portland  
City Hall  
1220 SW Fifth Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97204

Dear Mayor Clark:

Metro's Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) is concerned that several aspects of the study of East Bank Freeway alternatives are of regional significance and will require regional involvement:

1. I-5 is a very important element of the regional transportation system and any alternative improvement must meet the project objectives of the current East Marquam project. In particular, improved operation of I-5, improved access from I-5 to the Banfield Freeway and a direct connection for the Sunrise Corridor (via McLoughlin Boulevard) to I-5 are important transportation objectives of the region. The region will not be interested in approving an alternate project that does not meet these objectives.
2. The effect of the proposed study as well as any alternative that results from the study on federal highway funding is of regional concern:
  - . If a proposed alternative requires funding in excess of that currently committed to the East Marquam project, the region is concerned that insufficient resources are available. The region has established Interstate priorities for the next 10 years that will require a majority of statewide Interstate funding without the need for increased funding on the East Bank Freeway. Approving increased funds for the East Bank Freeway at the expense of other priorities is not likely.
  - . If the process for consideration of alternatives to the East Marquam project threatens to cause the loss of the currently committed funds, the region is concerned. Loss of these funds would be a severe financial impact and would damage the region's long-term ability to secure funding in the future.

**Metro Council**

Richard Waker  
Presiding Officer  
District 2

Jun Gardner  
Deputy Presiding  
Officer  
District 3

Mike Ragsdale  
District 1

Corky Kirkpatrick  
District 4

Tom DeJardin  
District 5

George Van Bergen  
District 6

Sharon Kelley  
District 7

Mike Bonner  
District 8

Tanya Collier  
District 9

Larry Cooper  
District 10

David Knowles  
District 11

Gary Hansen  
District 12

Executive Officers  
Rena Cusma

The Honorable J.E. (Bud) Clark  
December 23, 1987  
Page 2

3. June, 1988 and April, 1989 have been identified as critical decision points for the consideration of alternatives. Please provide a status report to the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) at these decision points and expect regional involvement in the decisions if any of these regional issues are affected.

Please be aware that TPAC and JPACT must approve the use of all federal highway and transit funding in the region and any alternatives to the East Marquam project should be consistent with these regional concerns.

Sincerely,



Andrew C. Cotugno, Chairman  
Metro's Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee

ACC:lmk

CC: TPAC  
JPACT

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE JPACT

DATE 1-14-88

NAME

AFFILIATION

NAME	AFFILIATION
✓ M- <u>Sauline Anderson</u>	<u>Multnomah County</u>
✓ M- <u>Bob Bothman</u>	<u>ODOT</u>
✓ MA- <u>Roy Rogers</u>	<u>WASH. CTY.</u>
G/M <u>Bonnie Hays</u>	<u>" "</u>
✓ M- <u>George Dean Bergeson</u>	<u>Metro</u>
✓ M- <u>Marionie H. Schumack</u>	<u>Cities of Mult County</u>
✓ M- <u>Tom Brian</u>	<u>Cities of Washington Co. (Wagon Ford)</u>
✓ M- <u>Ed Rudgeist</u>	<u>Clackamas County</u>
✓ M- <u>RICHARD WAKER</u>	<u>METRO</u>
✓ MA- <u>Wynnis West</u>	<u>POP</u>
✓ M- <u>James [unclear]</u>	<u>Tri-Met</u>
✓ <u>Joan Jones</u>	<u>Clackamas County</u>
✓ <u>Ted [unclear]</u>	<u>ODOT</u>
✓ <u>RICHARD ABERMANSON</u>	<u>NORTHWEST DIST. ASSOC</u>
✓ <u>Jane Sparovich</u>	<u>Clackamas County</u>
✓ M- <u>Earl Blumenauer</u>	<u>Portland</u>
✓ <u>Lee James</u>	<u>TRIMETS</u>
✓ <u>Grace Crumian</u>	<u>Pdx</u>
✓ <u>Lee LaFontaine</u>	<u>Public Trust Co</u>
✓ <u>Bebe Rucker</u>	<u>Port of Portland</u>
✓ <u>Peter F Fry</u>	<u>Self</u>
✓ <u>Robert Rogers</u>	<u>Chamber of Commerce</u>
✓ <u>JIM HOWELL</u>	<u>RIVERFRONT FOR PEOPLE</u>



COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE JDACT

DATE 1.14.1988

NAME

AFFILIATION

✓ Ray Polani

Citizens for Better Transit

✓ Robert Goldfield

Daily Journal of Commerce

✓ Carol L. Nielsen

Central Portland Industrial Council

✓ Richard Ross

TPAC - CITIES OF MWLT CO.

✓ Rick KUSHN

ODOT

✓ BOB WARNER

WV COUNTY

✓ STEVE DUTERRER

CITY OF PORTLAND